

*Abortion*

Charter of Rights and Freedoms, it by no means prevents Parliament from using its criminal law to restrict abortion. If this were the case, it would be all too convenient for elected representatives to avoid the controversial issue of abortion by insisting their hands are tied by the Supreme Court pronouncement.

The question as to whether an unborn child is a human being has been pondered, it has been considered, it has been discussed, and the decision arrived at by the medical profession and others is, yes, the unborn child is indeed a human being from the time of conception.

If this is a human life, then we are faced with a question, one that says yes or no to the entire abortion question. Should we give legal protection under the law to every human in this nation from the beginning of his or her life until each individual's natural death, or should we discriminate fatally under the law against entire classes of living humans?

For two millennia in our western culture, written into our Constitutions, specifically protected by our laws, and deeply imprinted in the hearts of all men and women, there has existed the absolute value of honouring and protecting the right of each human to live. This has been an inalienable and unequivocal right. The only exception has been that of balancing a life for a life in certain situations, or by due process of law.

Never in modern times, except by a small group of physicians in Hitler's Germany, and by Stalin in Russia, has a price-tag of economic or social usefulness been placed on an individual human life as the price of its continued existence. Never in modern times, except by physicians in Hitler's Germany, has a certain physical perfection been required as a condition necessary for the condition of that life. Never in modern times, has a state granted to a citizen the absolute legal right to have another killed in order to solve her own personal, social or economic problem. Yet, if this is a human life, the Canadian Supreme Court decision, as well as the permissive abortion laws in other countries do all of the above. They represent a complete aboutface, a total rejection of one of the core values of western man and an acceptance of a new ethic in which life is only of relative value. No longer will everyone have a right to live simply because he or she exists. Man will now be allowed to exist only if he measures up to certain standards of independence, physical perfection, or utilitarian usefulness to others. This is a momentous change that strikes at the very root of western civilization.

● (1630)

Last year more than 60,000 unborn babies were legally "terminated" in Canadian hospitals. This means destroyed for no offence at all. Abortion is an extreme form of child abuse inside the womb. It violently destroys a unique young human being. Some people claim that abortion is a woman's right. What is more, they insist that we should all be forced to pay for it with our taxes. They call themselves "pro-choice". There

is no freedom of choice for a child destroyed by abortion. Its every instinct is to live. As the pro-choice people use the phrase, a women's right to choose is really a right to destroy life.

Can anyone honestly claim this right? If it is wrong to kill timber rattlesnakes in some countries, how can it be all right to destroy helpless human beings? Don't we have a right to oppose this? All human life, before and after birth, has a right to protection; not just the strong, the whole, the well connected, but also the weak, the handicapped, and the unwanted.

You do not solve human problems, Mr. Speaker, by destroying human life. To place the issue of human abortion into its proper context, we must first know why abortions are being performed. Today there are only two primary medical indications for abortion: cancer of the cervix and womb and ectopic pregnancy. If the cancer is detected early in pregnancy, treatment of the mother would likely cause the loss of her unborn child. The other is with regard to ectopic pregnancy. In this situation, the child is developing in the Fallopian tubes instead of the womb. In this case, the unborn child would have to be removed to protect the life of the mother.

Such cases represent such a small number of actual abortions it becomes evident that the vast majority of Canada's approximately 60,000 yearly abortions cannot properly be called therapeutic. Section 1 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms states:

The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be justified in a free and democratic society.

In 1969, when the Criminal Code was amended to permit abortion under certain therapeutic circumstances, the intent was to maintain the basic rights of the unborn child while at the same time set reasonable limits to allow for therapeutic abortion in cases such as I have mentioned.

Since that time we have seen an increasing abuse of this law, to the point that we now have a situation in which abortion in Canada is undertaken primarily for socio-economic reasons. The clear intent is no longer to heal but to destroy the unborn child because he or she is supposedly unwanted and inconvenient. The wording in the Criminal Code addressed the seriousness of this act when it could not be justified on therapeutic grounds by a select committee of physicians.

Section 251(1) of the Criminal Code states:

Everyone who, with intent to procure the miscarriage of a female person . . . uses any means for the purpose of carrying out his intention is guilty of an indictable offence . . .

It is evident that Members of Parliament never intended to provide a loophole to legalize abortion on demand and thus remove all lawful protection from the unborn child.

Section 15(1) of the Charter prohibits discrimination based on age, and yet we continue to destroy 60,000 unborn babies every year for reasons of convenience. Is this not discrimination on the basis of age, because they are so young and not yet